



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/607,560	06/29/2000	Shekhar N. Swamy	MS147163.1	8517

27195 7590 10/07/2003

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

KISS, ERIC B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Applicati n No.

09/607,560

Applicant(s)

SWAMY ET AL.

Examin r

Eric B. Kiss

Art Unit

2122

--The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on th cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: 17, 19Claim(s) rejected: 1-16, 18, 20-24, 26-30

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

As per Applicant's arguments on page 3, in paragraph 4, continuing onto page 4, the Examiner maintains that Lindén discloses:

-- determining source node dependencies for the target node by tracing from the target node through the mapping to the source schema-

As disclosed by Lindén (see, for example, pages 49-51), a mapping connects the source and target grammars together based on the TT-grammar technique. In generating the mapping, the user connects source and target subgrammars by forming production group associations and specifying symbol associations. As described on page 21, in paragraph 4, and in Algorithm 3.2 on pages 33-34, the production group associations are used to generate target subtrees by processing the corresponding source subtrees. Thus, a tracing through the mapping from target to source is necessary in order to process source subtrees corresponding to the target subtrees.

-- generating a hierarchy match list for the target node-

As disclosed by Lindén (see, for example, page 56), a target parse tree corresponding to the source parse tree is constructed according to the TT-grammar. The target parse tree is a hierarchical data structure containing target nodes that are matched (corresponding to) the hierarchical data structure of source parse tree nodes based on the TT-grammar and corresponding specified mapping.

and

-- generating code according to the hierarchy match list-

As disclosed by Lindén (see, for example, section 4.3.2 on pages 51-52), code is generated according to the mapping and target parse tree. Lindén discloses specialized tools, such as STONE, which generates a mapper from the mapping specification, and SWINDLER, which generates an unparser from the target grammar.



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER